

# **COMMERce Information Technology Solutions (COMMITTS)**

## **BALANCED SCORECARD**



### **STATUS REPORT FOR**

**First Quarter  
FY 2000  
(October-December 1999)**

**Prepared by**

**COMMITTS Program Office  
Department of Commerce**



**SUMMARY REPORT  
FIRST QUARTER FY 2000**

In the first quarter of FY 2000<sup>1</sup> COMMITTS awarded six task orders, two in the Systems Operations & Management (SOM) functional area and four in the Information Systems Engineering (ISE) area.

The attached report provides status of the COMMITTS performance measures based on the information gathered in the Balanced Scorecard surveys of the Customers, Contracting Officers Technical Representatives, and the Vendors, as well as from the COMMITTS data base tracking system. Because this was the Program's start up period, there is not a full quarter's worth of data for some measures and therefore reporting status on these is being delayed.

After analysis of the available data, the results indicate that COMMITTS customers are satisfied with the COMMITTS process and with the time it takes to award a Task Order. The COMMITTS vendors are also pleased with the COMMITTS process. The following comments were provided on the survey:

*"[Our company] has been very impressed by the professionalism, dedication and commitment of the COMMITTS Program Office Staff. It is a pleasure working with all of them. We look forward to the COMMITTS Program reaching its anticipated potential."*

*"We got strong compliments from the customer through the COMMITTS PMO. These were verbal and in the context of ... 'the [Company] Team has been successfully working with a tough client and pleasing them.'"*

The only negative note was that there haven't been enough opportunities to submit proposals. This should improve soon as there are tasks in progress and many potential customers that are expected to start coming to fruition early in the second quarter.

Because this is the first COMMITTS Balanced Scorecard report, it includes some background and additional information in the pages that follow.

Any comments or questions on this report can be directed to Ruby C. May, COMMITTS Program Office, (202) 482-4748, or e-mail [rmay@doc.gov](mailto:rmay@doc.gov).

**COMMITTS Vision and Mission**

**Vision:** Small Businesses change the way Government IT problems are solved.

**Mission:** Provide mission critical information technology solutions through the use of all categories of small businesses through an innovative, disciplined, and streamlined approach.

---

<sup>1</sup> Our first two awards made on 9/29/99 and 9/30/99 are also included in this report.

## Background

A Balanced Scorecard is a disciplined approach to measure the true value and success of a program by linking the accomplishment of the mission and vision of the program to the measures themselves. The COMMITTS Balanced Scorecard was created through a team approach. First organized in August 1999, Mike Sade, the Acting Program Manager, brought together a Metrics Working Group that included a mix of COMMITTS Vendors and COMMITTS Program Office representatives. The group was on a fast track to first learn about the Balanced Scorecard and then to actually develop the appropriate performance measures that would show results of the Program. The team consisted of:


Mike Sade, COMMITTS Team  
Ruby May, COMMITTS Team  
Natasha Gassama, COMMITTS Team (on loan from the Chief Information Officer staff)  
Greg Bodmer, ARTEL, Incorporated  
Luis Riesco, AC Technologies  
Richard Price, Command Technologies, Inc.  
Bob Alexander, INDUS Corporation  
Bob Hamilton, Mentor Technologies, Inc.


## The Process


The Balanced Scorecard uses a four perspective framework: customer, financial, internal processes, and learning and growth, to translate the vision and mission in to the aspects to measure success. Objectives and measures for each of these perspectives were drafted by the Metrics Working Group, and reviewed by COMMITTS vendors, stakeholders, and customers. Responses to these reviews were evaluated and resulted in a performance framework that would apply to the COMMITTS mission and vision of innovative technology solutions with streamlined, disciplined approaches. This framework is described below and depicted on the following page with a snapshot of the first quarter's results.


- The customer perspective ensures a streamlined task order process; open communications and an effective customer partnership; continuous customer satisfaction based on delivery of quality solutions and performance; and fees at or below competition.
- The financial perspective measures efficiency in administering the program, and reports increases in dollars obligated.
- The internal process perspective ensures a disciplined project management approach; that timeliness, cost and performance are within the targeted parameters; an efficient requirements definition process; and that customer requirements are defined accurately and do not require a lot of rework before a task order is posted.
- The learning and growth perspective measures innovation in the vendors' solutions and how this innovation is recognized through awards and commendations; ensures an efficient and competent work staff through training and education; that there is full and increased participation of small, disadvantaged and woman-owned businesses; and that the COMMITTS vendors are satisfied with their growth through COMMITTS.

Snapshot of the First Quarter Results

| PERSPECTIVE  | OBJECTIVE                            | MEASURE  | 1 <sup>st</sup> QTR |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| <b>CUSTOMER</b><br> | Streamlined Process                  | Average time to award Task Order                                   | 17 days             |
|  |                                      | % customers satisfied with time to award Task Order                | 100%                |
|  | Meet or Exceed Customer Expectations | % customers satisfied with responsiveness of COMMITTS Team         | 100%                |
|  |                                      | % customers satisfied with quality of performance of COMMITTS Team | 100%                |
|  |                                      | % customers satisfied with solution                                | 100%                |
|  | Competitive Fees                     | % fees below Competition   | 66%                 |

| PERSPECTIVE   | OBJECTIVE                  | MEASURE                      | 1 <sup>st</sup> QTR     |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>FINANCE</b><br> | Administratively Efficient | Cost-to-Obligations ratio    | To be reported annually |
|   |                            |                              |                         |
|   | Growth in Obligations      | Total Dollars Obligated      | Not available this qtr  |
|   |                            | % of Total Dollars Obligated | Not available this qtr  |

| PERSPECTIVE  | OBJECTIVE                                | MEASURE  | 1 <sup>st</sup> QTR   |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| <b>INTERNAL PROCESS</b><br> | Effective Project Management             | % projects/deliverables on time or before                      | Not available         |
|  |  | % projects/deliverables within cost/price                      | Not available         |
|  |  | % of projects where performance measures are met or exceeded   | Not available         |
|  | Efficient requirement definition process | Average number of days from requirements definition to posting | 30.5 days             |
|  | Efficient requirements management        | % of changes per task order                                    | One task order change |

| PERSPECTIVE   | OBJECTIVE  | MEASURE  | 1 <sup>st</sup> QTR |
|---|--|--|---------------------|
| <b>LEARNING AND GROWTH</b><br> | Program Recognition  | Number of programs/projects recognized for COMMITTS work | 8                   |
|   |  | Number of awards received by COMMITTS Prime Contractors  | 1                   |
|   | Knowledge Development  | Hours training per employee                              | 22 total hours      |
|   | Greater Participation of Small, Disadvantaged and Women-owned Businesses | # of active Small, Disadvantaged Businesses              | 97%                 |
|   | Contractor Satisfaction  | % of revenue growth of prime contractors                 | 1.4%                |
|   |  | # of new customers                                       | 6                   |

### **Data Collection Methodology**

One of the important aspects of developing a Balanced Scorecard is to limit the burden of data collection. A simple survey tool was developed to collect the majority of the information required. Appendix A provides a copy of the survey. This survey was sent out to all Customers, Contracting Officers Technical Representatives and Vendors. The remainder of the data is collected in the COMMITTS database. Plans are to eventually set up an electronic tracking and reporting tool that will be accessible through the COMMITTS web page.

### **First Quarter Report**

The pages that follow provide a description of each measure within the four perspectives, the sources for collecting the data, and the first quarter FY 2000 results. Appendix B is a one-page compilation of the complete Balanced Scorecard.

### **Future**

As the COMMITTS Program grows, the Balanced Scorecard will continue to be refined and revised to ensure that the measures are realistic, results-oriented and indicative of the Program's mission and vision.

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: CUSTOMER</b> |
|------------------------------|

**Objective:**

Streamlined Process

**Measure:**

This is the customer's degree of satisfaction with the COMMITTS process.

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**Avg. time to award Task Order** – Average number of calendar days from posting on the COMMITTS Business opportunities (BOP) page to task order award. (*Standard Ordering Process = number of days from posting of Project Agreement to task order award.*)

**% customers satisfied with time to award Task Order** – Percentage of positive responses to this survey question compared to the total number of responses to this question. Time to award is the number of calendar days from completion of the project agreement or statement of work to task order award.

**Data Sources:**

COMMITTS data base  
Quarterly customer surveys

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure   | Target          | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Avg. time to award Task Order                       | 20 days         | 17 days             |                     |                     |                     |
| % customers satisfied with time to award Task Order | Baseline<br>TBD | 100%                |                     |                     |                     |

**First Quarter Notes:**

- Six tasks were awarded with an average of 17 calendar days
- Five of the six customers (83%) responded to the survey. Of those who responded, two strongly agreed, and three agreed, that they were satisfied with the time it took to award their task orders.

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: CUSTOMER</b> |
|------------------------------|

**Objective:**

Meet or Exceed Customer Expectations

**Measure:**

This is the customer's degree of satisfaction with responsiveness of the COMMITTS Program Office and quality of service delivery.

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**% customers satisfied with responsiveness of COMMITTS PMO** – Percentage of positive responses to this survey question compared to the total number of responses to this question. Responsiveness encompasses the interaction between the COMMITTS Program Office personnel and the customer personnel and promptness in resolving any issues that arise in generating a comprehensive and understandable performance-based statement of work and/or project agreement.

**% customers satisfied with quality of performance of COMMITTS PMO** -- Percentage of positive responses to this survey question compared to the total number of responses to this question. Quality of performance encompasses the value of the suggestions made by the COMMITTS Project Office during the generation of the project agreement, and the adequacy of the task order monitoring.

**% customers satisfied with the solution/contractor** -- Percentage of positive responses to this survey question compared to the total number of responses to this question. Satisfaction with the solution encompasses the ability of the solution to fully satisfy the customer needs addressed by the task order.

**Data Sources:**

Quarterly customer surveys

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure   | Target          | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| % customers satisfied with responsiveness of COMMITTS PMO         | Baseline<br>TBD | 100%                |                     |                     |                     |
| % customers satisfied with quality of performance of COMMITTS PMO | Baseline<br>TBD | 100%                |                     |                     |                     |
| % customers satisfied with the solution/contractor                | Baseline<br>TBD | 100%                |                     |                     |                     |

**First Quarter Notes:**

- Five of the six customers (83%) customers responded. Four strongly agreed and one agreed with the first two measures; three strongly agreed and two agreed with the third measure; indicating satisfaction with responsiveness and performance of the Program Office and with the contractor and their solutions.

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: CUSTOMER</b> |
|------------------------------|

**Objective:**

Competitive Fees

**Measure:**

Keep fees at or below other GWACs.

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**% fees below competition** – The arithmetic difference between the average of the fees (as a percentage) charged by competing GWAC vehicles for which this information is available and the average fee charged by COMMITTS.

**Data Sources:**

Research by Program Office into the current GWAC fee structures; data to be compiled quarterly.

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure                  | Target          | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| % fees below competition | Baseline<br>TBD | 66%                 |                     |                     |                     |

**First Quarter Notes:**

The standard COMMITTS Fee structure averages .87%. This is further reduced through negotiations when the obligated value of the task is \$5 million and greater.

Fees for other GWACs have been difficult to determine. The following are those for which we have information available:

NASA SEWP II = .75% (NASA SEWP III is in the solicitation stage)

DOT ITOP = average 1.50%

DOD/DEIS = 2.00%

GSA FSS = 1.00%

Average = 1.31%



**PERSPECTIVE: FINANCIAL****Objective:**

Administratively Efficient

**Measure:**

Maintain efficiency of administrative functions

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**Cost-to-Obligations ratio** – The ratio of the cost of the COMMITTS Program Office operations to the funding obligated to COMMITTS task orders.

Annual target is \$1.7M operations budget/FY 2000 goal of \$295M obligation

**Data Sources:**

Data maintained by the COMMITTS Contracting Officer; report to be compiled annually.

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure                   | Target | FY 00 |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|
| Cost-to-Obligations ratio | .0058  |       |

To be reported at the end of the fiscal year.

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: FINANCIAL</b> |
|-------------------------------|

**Objective:**

Growth in Obligations

**Measure:**

Increase the dollars obligated

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**Total Dollars Obligated** – The total funding obligated to COMMITTS task orders.

**% of Total Dollars Obligated** – The total funding obligated to COMMITTS task orders, as a percentage of the target of \$295 Million (FY 2000 goal to reach the total \$1.5B).

**Data Sources:**

Data maintained by the COMMITTS Contracting Officer; report to be compiled quarterly.

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure                      | Target        | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Total Dollars Obligated      | \$295 Million | *                   |                     |                     |                     |
| % of Total Dollars Obligated | \$295 Million | *                   |                     |                     |                     |

\*This information is not available for first quarter FY 2000. We will report on this measure beginning in second quarter.

|                                      |
|--------------------------------------|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: INTERNAL PROCESS</b> |
|--------------------------------------|

**Objective:**

Effective Project Management – COMMITTS Prime Vendors

**Measure:**

This will measure how well the COMMITTS vendors ensure discipline in project management.

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**% of projects/deliverables on time or before** – The percent of task order deliveries made on time or before the delivery dates as negotiated between the contractor and the COTR (determined by the number of deliveries actually delivered on or before the delivery dates compared to the total number of deliveries for all COMMITTS task orders).

**% of projects delivered within cost/price** – The percent of task orders completed within the cost/price specified in the task order (as adjusted for all negotiated changes to the original task order).

**Data Sources:**

Quarterly survey of Contracting Officers Technical Representatives  
Monthly Program Status Report

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure                                      | Target | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|--|--------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| % of projects/deliverables on time or before | 90 %   | *                   |                     |                     |                     |
| % of projects delivered within cost/price    | 90%    | *                   |                     |                     |                     |

\* There were six task awards in the first quarter. However, most of the first deliverables are due beginning in the second quarter. There is not enough data available to report on these measures for the first quarter.

|                                      |
|--------------------------------------|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: INTERNAL PROCESS</b> |
|--------------------------------------|

**Objective:**

Effective Project Management – COMMITTS Program Management Office

**Measure:**

This will measure the effectiveness of the project manager to track performance as defined in the statement of work

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**% of projects where SOW performance measures are met or exceeded** – The percent of SOW performance measures met or exceeded for all performance measures specified by the SOW (determined by counting the number of performance measures met or exceeded during the measurement period compared to the total number of performance measures for all COMMITTS task orders).

**Data Sources:**

Quarterly survey of Contracting Officers Technical Representatives.

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure  | Target | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|--|--------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| % of projects where SOW performance measures are met or exceeded | TBD    | *                   |                     |                     |                     |

\* There were six task awards in the first quarter. However, first deliverables are due beginning in the second quarter. There is not enough data available to report on these measures for the first quarter.

**PERSPECTIVE: INTERNAL PROCESS****Objective:**

Efficient requirements definition process

**Measure:**

This will measure how well the Program Office and customer define the task order requirements

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**Avg number of days from requirements definition to posting** – The number of calendar days between concept definition regarding a specific task in a written first draft Statement of Work and the posting of an RFI or RFS on the COMMITTS BOP web page averaged over all COMMITTS task orders.

**Data Sources:**

Quarterly review of COMMITTS database

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure  | Target | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|--|--------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Avg number of days from requirements definition to posting | TBD    | 30.5 Days           |                     |                     |                     |

|                                      |
|--------------------------------------|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: INTERNAL PROCESS</b> |
|--------------------------------------|

**Objective:**

Efficient requirements management

**Measure:**

This will measure the need to make changes to the task orders by the COTRs

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**% of changes to the task order** – The number of changes made to a task order SOW following the task order award as a percentage of all COMMITTS task orders. Does not include additional requirements.

**Data Sources:**

Quarterly survey of Contracting Officers Technical Representatives.

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure                        | Target          | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| % of changes to the task order | Baseline<br>TBD | *                   |                     |                     |                     |

\*There was one task order change in the First Quarter.

|   |
|---|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: LEARNING AND GROWTH</b> |
|---|

**Objective:**

Program Recognition

**Measure:**

This will track recognition of contractor innovation and awards received, as reported by the Vendors.

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**Number of programs/projects recognized for COMMITTS work** – The number of COMMITTS task order projects for which specific recognition was given by the task order customer (letter of commendation or other formal recognition) or for which the task order contractor was given specific formal recognition for work done on the task order by any independent source.

**Number of awards received by COMMITTS prime contractors**– The number of formal awards received by the COMMITTS prime contractors. Such awards include national, regional, or local recognition (such as certificates or letters of commendation) received for the quality of IT products or services provided, or for the quality of any of the processes used in providing IT products or services. An award need not be for work performed on a COMMITTS task order(s).

**Data Sources:**

Quarterly survey of vendors

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure  | Target | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|--|--------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Number of programs/projects recognized for COMMITTS work | TBD    | 8                   |                     |                     |                     |
| Number of awards received by COMMITTS prime contractors  | TBD    | 1                   |                     |                     |                     |

|   |
|---|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: LEARNING AND GROWTH</b> |
|---|

**Objective:**

Knowledge Development

**Measure:**

This will ensure an efficient, competent work staff

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**Hours training per employee** – The average hours of training per employee in the COMMITTS Program Office and *for all of the COMMITTS prime contractors that support the COMMITTS effort that provide this information to the COMMITTS Program Office.*

**Data Sources:**

Quarterly survey of vendors  
Internal Program Office records

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure                     | Target | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Hours training per employee | TBD    | 22 hours<br>total   |                     |                     |                     |

Vendors reported 18 hours of training; COMMITTS Program Office recorded 4 hours.



**PERSPECTIVE: LEARNING AND GROWTH****Objective:**

Greater participation of Small, Disadvantaged and Women-Owned Businesses

**Measure:**

This will measure full and increased participation of SDBs

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**Number of active SDBs** – The number of Small Disadvantaged Businesses whose personnel have participated in the conduct of COMMITTS task orders.

**Data Sources:**

Data maintained by the Contracting Officer

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure               | Target          | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Number of active SDBs | Baseline<br>TBD | 97%                 |                     |                     |                     |

Of those vendors participating, 97% are SDBs.

|   |
|---|
| <b>PERSPECTIVE: LEARNING AND GROWTH</b> |
|---|

**Objective:**

Contractor Satisfaction

**Measure:**

This will measure the degree of vendor satisfaction in the area of revenue and customer growth.

**Performance Measures/Definitions:**

**% revenue growth of prime contractors** – The average rate of revenue growth for those COMMITTS prime contractors who report this information to the COMMITTS Program Office.

**Number of new customers** – The number of customers using the COMMITTS GWAC for the first time. A customer is the smallest organizational unit of a government department or agency that is the recipient of all the products/services obtained using a single COMMITTS task order (e.g., project office, administrative office, field office).

**Data Sources:**

Annual survey of vendors  
COMMITTS Data base

**FY 2000 Performance Report Status:**

| Measure                               | Target | 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr | 4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| % revenue growth of prime contractors | TBD    | 1.4%                |                     |                     |                     |
| Number of new customers               | TBD    | 6                   |                     |                     |                     |

Of the seven vendors who responded, one reported a 10% growth in revenue.